

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 were presented for examination. Claims 1-34 were rejected in the Office Action dated January 12, 2007.

Applicants are hereby amending claims 1, 21, and 33. Applicants are hereby canceling claims 2-20, and 22-32. Applicants are hereby adding new claims 35-52. Support for the new claims can be found, for example, as follows:

claims 35 and 46 in paragraph [0049];

claims 36 and 47 in [0110];

claims 37 and 48 in [0159];

claims 38 and 49 in [0049];

claims 39 and 50 in [0028];

claims 40 and 51 in [0051];

claim 41 in [0080];

claims 42-44 in [0070] – [0072]; and

claims 45 and 52 in [0048].

No new matter is introduced by the amendments.

Claim 33: Claim 33 is statutory subject matter because it recites functional descriptive material recorded in a computer-readable storage medium.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 33 is hereby amended, and claim 34 is hereby canceled. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 33, as amended, recites a “computer program product comprising a computer readable storage medium.” Applicants submit that claim 33 is statutory, at least because claim 33 recites functional descriptive material recorded in a computer-readable storage medium. MPEP 2106.01 explicitly states that:

a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program’s functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Claim 33, as amended, recites that “at a first sensor service unit, generate first video data . . . ; at a management console, display an immersive panoramic video . . . ; and at a data repository, store or retrieve the first video data . . . ” Therefore, claim 33 specifies which part of the computerized system (e.g., the first sensor service unit) realizes which functionality (e.g., generate the first video data) of the computer program. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 as amended meets the requirement set forth in MPEP 2106.01. For this reason, Applicants submit that claim 33 is statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are moot.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 12, 18, 22, 24, 26, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 12, 28, 22, 24, 26, and 32 are hereby canceled. Therefore, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 1, 21 and 33: Hendricks does not disclose “a first immersive panoramic sensor for capturing in real time two or more overlapping digital images to generate first video data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view.”

Claims 1-12, 14-31, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0010804 to Hendricks et al. (“Hendricks”). Claims 1, 21, and 33 are hereby amended. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, specifically recites:

“a first sensor service unit operatively coupled to *a first immersive panoramic sensor for capturing in real time two or more overlapping digital images to generate first video data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view of the environment. . .*” (emphasis added).

In a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every claim element must be present in the applied reference. Hendricks, however, does not disclose *“a first immersive panoramic sensor for capturing in real time two or more overlapping digital images to generate first video data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view”* as recited in claim 1 as amended. In Hendricks, the remote camera uses a spherical lens (or other wide angle lens) to capture a *single* spherical image. See Hendricks, paragraphs [0121] and [0170]. That is, the remote camera of Hendricks does not capture *two or more overlapping digital images*. Nowhere in Hendricks does it describe that overlapping digital images are captured to generate an immersive panoramic field of view.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended is patentably distinct from Hendricks. Claims 35-45 are dependent from claim 1; and thus, essentially the

same arguments are equally applicable to claims 35-45. Therefore, claims 35-45 are also patentably distinct from Hendricks.

Claims 21 and 33, as amended, also recite “generating [or generate] first video data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view of the environment from *two or more overlapping digital images* captured in real time by a first immersive panoramic sensor.” Therefore, the same arguments set forth above with regard to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 21, its dependent claims 46-52, and claim 33. Thus, claims 21, 33, and 46-52 are also patentably distinct from Hendricks.

Claims 13 and 32: Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are moot.

On page 7 of the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected as being unpatentable over Hendricks in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,803 to Jacquin et al. (“Jacquin”). Claim 13 is hereby canceled. Therefore, this rejection is now moot.

On page 8 of the Office Action, claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0024233 to Urisaka et al. (“Urisaka”) and Jacquin. Claim 32 is hereby canceled. Therefore, this rejection is now moot.

Although not necessary, claims 1, 21, and 33, as amended, are addressed herein in view of Hendricks, Jacquin, and Urisaka to obviate a further Office Action based on Hendricks, Jacquin, and Urisaka; and to expedite prosecution of this patent application.

As set forth above, claim 1, as amended, specifically recites “*a first immersive panoramic sensor for capturing in real time two or more overlapping digital images to generate first video*

*data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view.”* This aspect of the claimed invention is advantageous because blind spots in the digital images can be significantly reduced by generating the video data from two or more overlapping digital images. See specification, paragraph [0007].

This claimed feature of the present invention is not shown or suggested by any of the cited references taken either alone or in combination. As set forth above, Hendricks does not teach or suggest “*a first immersive panoramic sensor for capturing in real time two or more overlapping digital images to generate first video data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view.”*

Neither does Jacquin teach or suggest this aspect of the claimed invention. Jacquin is cited by the Office action for merely teaching or suggesting a motion adaptive modeling of scene content. Nowhere in Jacquin does it teach or suggest that “overlapping digital images” can be captured to generate an immersive panoramic field of view.

Urisaka also fails to teach or suggest “*a first immersive panoramic sensor for capturing in real time two or more overlapping digital images to generate first video data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view.”* Urisaka is cited in the Office Action merely for teaching a two dimensional map showing the location and orientation of sensors. Nowhere in Urisaka does it teach or suggest that “overlapping digital images” can be captured to generate an immersive panoramic field of view.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinct from Hendricks in view of Jacquin and Urisaka. Claims 35-45 are dependent from claim 1; and thus, essentially the same arguments are equally applicable to claims 35-45.

Therefore, claims 35-45 are also patentably distinct from Hendricks in view of Jacquin and Urisaka.

Claims 21 and 33, as amended, also recite “generating [or generate] first video data representing a first immersive panoramic field of view of the environment from *two or more overlapping digital images* captured in real time by a first immersive panoramic sensor.” Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above with regard to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 21, its dependent claims 46-52, and claim 33. Thus, claims 21, 33, and 46-52 are also patentably distinct from Hendricks in view of Jacquin and Urisaka.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Closing

Applicants are submitting herewith claims 1, 21, 33, and 35-52 to provide the scope and breadth of claims coverage to which it believes it is entitled.

Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance of all claims herein, and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicant's attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 7, 2007

By: /Dohyun Ahn/

Dohyun Ahn  
Ltd. Rec. No. L0359  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
(650) 335-7291 (Tel)  
(650) 938-5200 (Fax)